

| PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER | |
|-------------------------|--|

| | Absolute Rating | Improvement Rating | Adequate Yearly Progress |
|------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 2001 | Good | Good | N/A |
| 2002 | Good | Below Average | N/A |
| 2003 | Good | Below Average | N/A |
| 2004 | | • | |

| TENTH GRADE PASSAGE OF ONE OR MORE SUBTESTS OF THE EXIT EXAM | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|------|------|------|------|
| | | Our School High Schools with Students Like Ours | | | | |
| Percent | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 |
| Passed all 3 subtests | 72.2 | 75.0 | 73.3 | 75.0 | 73.0 | 71.8 |
| Passed 2 subtests | 17.9 | 14.9 | 16.7 | 13.8 | 15.5 | 16.1 |
| Passed 1 subtest | 6.8 | 5.8 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.5 |
| Passed no subtests | 3.0 | 4.3 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.1 |

| PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| | Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2003 | | Eligibility for LIFE Scholarships* | | Graduation Rate | |
| All Charles | n 227 | % 96.0 | n 198 | % 14.6 | n 244 | % 76.0 |
| All Students Gender | 221 | 96.0 | 198 | 14.6 | 244 | 76.2 |
| | 110 | 05.5 | 00 | 10.5 | 447 | 70.4 |
| Male | 110 | 95.5 | 88 | 12.5 | 117 | 70.1 |
| Female | 117 | 96.6 | 110 | 16.4 | 127 | 81.9 |
| Race or Ethnic Group | | | | | | |
| African American | 39 | 92.3 | 34 | 0.0 | 43 | 69.8 |
| Hispanic | 5 | 100.0 | 5 | 0.0 | 3 | I/S |
| White | 183 | 96.7 | 159 | 18.2 | 198 | 76.3 |
| Other | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Disability Status | | | | | | |
| Non-speech disabilities | 13 | 84.6 | 18 | 0.0 | 28 | 35.7 |
| Students without disabilities | 214 | 96.7 | 180 | 16.1 | 216 | 81.5 |
| Migrant Status | | | | | | |
| Migrant | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Non-migrant | 2 | I/S | 198 | 14.6 | 10 | 99.0 |
| English Proficiency | | | | | | |
| Limited English proficient | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| Non-LEP | 211 | 97.2 | 198 | 14.6 | 244 | 76.2 |
| Lunch Status | | | | | | |
| Subsidized meals | 52 | 96.2 | 37 | 2.7 | 70 | 44.3 |
| Full-pay meals | 175 | 96.0 | 161 | 17.4 | 174 | 89.1 |
| n = number of students on which per | centage is cald | ulated | | | | |

Percent of Our School High Schools with Students Like Ours Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions* Seniors who met the SAT requirement 14.6 20.0 Seniors who met the grade point average 57.1 58.8

^{*}Using only the SAT and grade point average requirements

| SCHOOL PROFILE | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| | OurSchool | Change from Last Year | High Schools with Students Like Ours | Median High School |
| Students (n= 1,000) | | | | |
| Retention rate | 6.8% | Up from 6.7% | 6.6% | 7.3% |
| Attendance rate | 96.8% | Down from 97.4% | 95.6% | 95.5% |
| Eligible for gifted and talented With disabilities other than speech | 17.0% 13.4% | Up from 15.7% Up from 11.3% | 9.7% 12.1% | 5.1% 12.2% |
| Older than usual for grade Suspended or expelled | 7.2% 2.8% | Up from 6.7% Down from 3.5% | 7.2% 2.1% | 10.1% 2.3% |
| Enrolled in AP/IB programs Successful on AP/IB exams | 5.0% N/A | N/A N/A | N/A N/A | 10.2% N/A |
| Annual dropout rate | 4.1% | Down from 8.2% | 2.9% | 2.7% |
| Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations | 18.5% | Down from 23.6% | 0.7% | 3.2% |
| Enrollment in career/technology center courses | r 635 | Up from 480 | 568 | 433 |
| Students participating in worked-based experiences | 50.0% | Up from 10.1% | 29.6% | 26.3% |
| Career/technology students mastering core competencies | 78.9% | Down from 83.6% | 75.5% | 74.9% |
| Career/technology completers placed | 100.0% | No change | 100.0% | 99.5% |
| Teachers (n= 55) | | | | |
| Teachers with advanced degrees | 52.7% | Down from 54.4% | 56.7% | 51.7% |
| Continuing contract teachers | 94.5% | Down from 94.7% | 84.7% | 81.8% |
| Highly qualified teachers | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Teachers returning from previous year | | Up from 88.5% | 87.2% | 85.1% |
| Teacher attendance rate Average teacher salary | 94.8% \$40,303 | Down from 95.5% Up 0.2% | 96.2% \$41,190 | 95.8% \$40,303 |
| Prof. development days/teacher | 14.3 days | Up from 11.0 days | 10.3 days | 10.3 days |
| School | | | | |
| Principal's years at school | 8.0 | Up from 7.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Student-teacher ratio | 29.7 to 1 | Up from 29.6 to 1 | 26.7 to 1 | 26.2 to 1 |
| Prime instructional time Dollars spent per pupil* | 89.0% \$6,102 | Down from 91.5% Down 4.6% | 90.8% \$6,071 | 90.1% \$6,279 |
| Percent spent on teacher salaries* | 52.2% | Up from 49.5% | 59.5% | 57.8% |
| Opportunities in the arts | Excellent | No change | Excellent | Excellent |
| Parents attending conferences SACS accreditation | 96.8% yes | Down from 99.4% N/A | 84.9% yes | 87.8% yes |
| | | | | |

| * Prior ve | ar audited | l financial | data ar | e reported. |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| | | | | |

| | Our District | State | |
|---|--------------|-------|--|
| Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools | N/A | N/A | |
| | | | |
| Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools | N/A | N/A | |

Abbreviations for Missing Data

| | | • | |
|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| N/A Not Applicable | N/C Not Collected | N/R Not Reported | I/S Insufficient Sample |

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

Construction at Belton-Honea Path High School presented daily challenges for students, parents, and staff. The first day of school for students was delayed two days due to district-wide construction projects. The first month of school, students adapted to not having a public address system, no bells, no library, and a small gravel student parking lot a short hike from the school. Power outages and unscheduled fire alarms were frequent occurrences throughout the year. Twenty-two teachers moved their classrooms during the year and all but eighteen teachers were required to pack and move their rooms to storage containers the last week of school. Although teaching and learning were hindered, most of the students and staff were patient and cooperative.

Good students continue to be the strength of BHP. Our Air Force JROTC earned the Distinguished Unit Award for the 2002-2003 school year. Farm Day, sponsored by the FFA and agriculture classes, brought 500 pre-school and kindergarten students to our campus to learn about farm animals, plants, and equipment. Student Appreciation Day, sponsored by our Student Council, was a fun day for students near the end of the year. Graduating seniors earned in excess of 980,000 dollars in academic, work, and military scholarships.

Faculty, staff, and students continued to focus on improving test scores. After school tutoring sessions were set up for all math students and for freshman English students. Numerous other teachers provided extra help for students before and after school throughout the year. Students who performed poorly on state or district tests were assigned to remediation classes in English, writing, and math in addition to their regular English and math classes. A workshop for ACT/SAT improvement was also offered to students during the summer. Eight teachers began working on National Board Certification. If all pass, twelve teachers will have completed the requirements for National Board Certification.

The Renaissance Program recognized students for their accomplishments in academics, behavior/citizenship, and attendance. Over 500 students were invited to attend the "Evening of Excellence" who maintained an outstanding record in those areas for the entire school year. Eight thousand dollars in scholarships as well as numerous prizes and gifts were presented. Local business and industry and an annual golf tournament support the Renaissance Program.

Jimmy Ouzts Principal

| EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Teachers Students Parents | | | | | | | | |
| Number of surveys returned | Number of surveys returned 54 146 20 | | | | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with learning environment | 90.6% | 58.9% | 80.0% | | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with social and physical environment 98.0% 67.6% 75.0% | | | | | | | | |
| Percent satisfied with home-school relations | 75.9% | 75.2% | 85.0% | | | | | |

DEFINITIONS OF SCHOOL RATING TERMS

- Excellent School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Good School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specified that the statewide target is met for all students and for each subgroup of students: racial/ethnic, economic, disability, limited English proficiency and migrant status.